

United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge	John J. Tharp Jr.	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge	Sheila Finnegan
CASE NUMBER	10 C 5486	DATE	12/13/2012
CASE TITLE	Maureen Reiff vs. Calumet City, et al.		

DOCKET ENTRY TEXT

Motion hearing held on 12/13/2012. Plaintiff's motion to stay the plaintiff's response to defendant's second motion to dismiss (sic -- second motion for sanctions) [204], [207] is denied for the reasons stated in open court. However, Plaintiff is given additional time, until 1/2/2013, to respond to the second motion for sanctions [198]. Defendants' reply due by 1/16/2013.

■ [For further details see text below.]

Mailed notice.

*Copy to judge/magistrate judge.

00:25

STATEMENT

Plaintiff may also issue limited discovery (identified in open court) and may describe in her responsive brief the nature and relevance of the potential new information that she seeks through discovery. It should be noted that Plaintiff has been on notice since at least 8/23/2012 of the Bulich affidavit and other evidence in defendants' possession relating to Plaintiff's alleged false statements concerning her residency. Defendants also included this evidence as exhibits to their initial second motion for sanctions (155) filed on 8/29/2012. After Plaintiff's deposition on 10/5/2012, defendants filed an amended second motion for sanctions (198) that included information from the deposition, and the court set a new briefing schedule as requested by the parties. Plaintiff's response to the motion was due on 12/7/2012. Plaintiff's counsel, Luke Casson, waited until 12/7/2012 to file a motion seeking a stay of the briefing in order to depose Mr. Bulich and serve new subpoenas, and did not notice that motion for hearing until 12/13/2012. It should also be noted that Plaintiff's counsel has repeatedly missed court-imposed deadlines for filing pleadings even after multiple warnings from the court. *See* Doc. 17 (district judge dismissed lawsuit after no response was filed to motion to dismiss); Doc. 25 (district judge reinstated case but warned that "compliance with the briefing schedule is not optional."); Doc. 44 (after failing to file a response to motion dismiss by deadline of 4/12/2011, plaintiff filed a motion on 4/13/2011 seeking extension of time and noticed it for hearing on 4/19/2011); Doc. 47 (district judge grants motion for extension of time, stating "Counsel for plaintiff is reminded that motions for extensions of time must be noticed by such date to allow the court to rule prior to the due date of the filing at issue."); Doc. 75 (after failing to file a response to motion to dismiss by deadline of 6/30/2011, plaintiff filed on 7/7/2011 a motion for leave to file the response instant); Doc. 144 (after failing to file a response to a motion for a protective order by deadline of 8/10/2012, plaintiff filed motion on 8/14/2012 for leave to file instant).